arXiv:1302.6706v1 [math.AC] 27 Feb 2013

Complete intersections in simplicial toric varieties

Isabel Bermejo[*], Ignacio García-Marco

February 28, 2013

Abstract

Given a set $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}^m$ of nonzero vectors defining a simplicial toric ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}} \subset k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, where k is an arbitrary field, we provide an algorithm for checking whether $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection or not. This algorithm does not require the explicit computation of a minimal set of generators of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$. The algorithm is based on the application of some new results concerning toric ideals to the simplicial case. For simplicial projective toric ideals, we provide a simpler version of this algorithm. Moreover, when k is an algebraically closed field, we list all ideal-theoretic complete intersection simplicial projective toric varieties that are either smooth or have one singular point.

1 Introduction

Let k be an arbitrary field and $k[x] = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ and $k[t] = k[t_1, \ldots, t_m]$ two polynomial rings over k. A *binomial* in $k[x]$ is a difference of two monomials. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ be a set of nonzero vectors in $\mathbb{N}^m$; each vector $a_i = (a_{i1}, \ldots, a_{im})$ corresponds to a monomial $t^{a_i} = t_1^{a_{i1}} \cdots t_m^{a_{im}}$ in $k[t]$. The *toric set* Γ determined by $\mathcal{A}$ is the subset of the affine space $\mathbb{A}_k^n$ given parametrically by $x_i = t_1^{a_{i1}} \cdots t_m^{a_{im}}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, i.e.,

$$\Gamma = \{(t_1^{a_{11}} \cdots t_m^{a_{1m}}, \ldots, t_1^{a_{n1}} \cdots t_m^{a_{nm}}) \in \mathbb{A}_k^n \,|\, t_1, \ldots, t_m \in k\}\,.$$

The kernel of the homomorphism of k-algebras $\varphi\colon k[x] \to k[t];\ x_i \longmapsto t^{a_i}$ is called the *toric ideal* of Γ and will be denoted by $I_{\mathcal{A}}$. By [25, Corollary 4.3], it is an $\mathcal{A}$-*homogeneous binomial* ideal, i.e., if one sets the $\mathcal{A}$-degree of a monomial $x^b \in k[x]$ as $\deg_{\mathcal{A}}(x^b) := b_1 a_1 + \cdots + b_n a_n \in \mathbb{N}^m$, and says that a polynomial $f \in k[x]$ is $\mathcal{A}$-homogeneous if its monomials have the same $\mathcal{A}$-degree, then $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is generated by $\mathcal{A}$-homogeneous binomials. According to [25, Lemma 4.2], the height of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is equal to $n - \mathrm{rk}(\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{A})$, where $\mathrm{rk}(\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{A})$ denotes the rank of the subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}^m$ generated by $\mathcal{A}$. By [27, Corollary 7.1.12], if k is an infinite field, $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the ideal $I(\Gamma)$ of the polynomials vanishing in Γ. The variety $V(I_{\mathcal{A}}) \subset \mathbb{A}_k^n$ is called an *affine toric variety*.

---

[*] Partially supported by Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, Spain (MTM2010-20279-C02-02).

The ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a *complete intersection* if $\mu(I_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathrm{ht}(I_{\mathcal{A}})$, where $\mu(I_{\mathcal{A}})$ denotes the minimal number of generators of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$. Equivalently, $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection if there exists a set of $s = n - \mathrm{rk}(\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{A})$ $\mathcal{A}$-homogeneous binomials $g_1, \ldots, g_s$ such that $I_{\mathcal{A}} = (g_1, \ldots, g_s)$. The problem of determining complete intersection toric ideals has a long history; see the introduction of [22] and the references there.

If $n > m$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{d_1e_1, \ldots, d_me_m, a_{m+1}, \ldots, a_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}^m$, where $d_1, \ldots, d_m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\{e_1, \ldots, e_m\}$ is the canonical basis of $\mathbb{Z}^m$, the toric ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is said to be a *simplicial toric ideal* and $V(I_{\mathcal{A}}) \subset \mathbb{A}_k^n$ an *affine simplicial toric variety.* If k is an algebraically closed field and $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a simplicial toric ideal, by [19, Corollary 2] one has that $\Gamma = V(I_{\mathcal{A}})$, i.e., Γ is an affine simplicial toric variety. If $d_1 = \cdots = d_m = \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij}$ for all $i \in \{m+1, \ldots, n\}$, then $I_{\mathcal{A}}$, which is a homogeneous ideal, is called a *simplicial projective toric ideal* and $V(I_{\mathcal{A}}) \subset \mathbb{P}_k^{n-1}$ a *simplicial projective toric variety.*

The aim of this work is to obtain and implement an efficient algorithm for checking whether or not a simplicial toric ideal is a complete intersection.

In [2] we proposed an algorithm for checking whether the toric ideal of an affine monomial curve is a complete intersection, this algorithm is based on the ideas introduced in [5] and we implemented it in SINGULAR [10], giving rise to the library `cimonom.lib` [3]. This work is a generalization of [2] for simplicial toric ideals and gives rise to the SINGULAR library `cisimplicial.lib` [4], which generalizes, outperforms and substitutes our previous `cimonom.lib`.

It is worth pointing out that García-Sánchez and Rosales provided in [15] a theoretical characterization of the property of being a complete intersection in simplicial toric ideals via the so called *semigroup gluing.* Our approach to the problem of determining complete intersection simplicial toric ideals is different in nature to that of [15].

The main achievement of this work is Algorithm CI-simplicial, an algorithm which receives as input $\mathcal{A} = \{d_1e_1, \ldots, d_me_m, a_{m+1}, \ldots, a_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}^m$ and returns TRUE if the simplicial toric ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection or FALSE otherwise. Moreover, whenever $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection, the algorithm provides without any extra effort a minimal set of $\mathcal{A}$-homogeneous binomials generating $I_{\mathcal{A}}$. This algorithm is based on the application of some new results concerning complete intersection toric ideals to the simplicial case. Correctness of Algorithm CI-simplicial is proved in Theorem 3.5, which is the main result of this paper.

The structure of the paper is the following.

Section 2 is devoted to present two results on complete intersection toric ideals, namely Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 2.14. The first one is based on the idea of associating to $\mathcal{A}$ another set $\mathcal{A}_{red} \subset \mathbb{N}^m$ that can be either empty or defines a toric ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}_{red}}$ satisfying that $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection if and only if either $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$ or $I_{\mathcal{A}_{red}}$ is a complete intersection. Moreover, in case $\mathcal{A}_{red}$ is not empty, $I_{\mathcal{A}_{red}} \subset k[x_1, \ldots, x_r]$ with $r \leq n$ and the degrees of the generators of $I_{\mathcal{A}_{red}}$ are lower than those in $I_{\mathcal{A}}$. The construction of $\mathcal{A}_{red}$ is described algorithmically and, as a consequence of this, if $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$ or one knows a minimal set of generators of $I_{\mathcal{A}_{red}}$, one can recover a minimal set of generators of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$.

The second result relies upon the computation of m_i for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. Whenever a_i belongs to the cone in $\mathbb{R}^m$ spanned by $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\}$, one can set

$$m_i := \min \left\{ b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid b a_i \in \textstyle\sum_{\substack{j \in \{1,\ldots,n\} \\ j \neq i}} \mathbb{N} a_j \right\}$$

and in case there exist $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ such that $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$, we define $a_i' := (a_{i1}', \ldots, a_{im}') \in \mathbb{N}^m$, where $a_{ik}' = 0$ if $a_{ik} = 0$ or $a_{ik}' = \gcd\{a_{ik}, a_{jk}\}$ otherwise. Theorem 2.14 states among other things that if $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$ for some $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, whenever $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection, then so is $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$, where $\mathcal{A}' := (\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i, a_j\}) \cup \{a_i'\}$. For proving this result we use the relationship between mixed dominating matrices and complete intersection toric ideals established by Fischer and Shapiro [13].

Section 3 is devoted to design Algorithm CI-simplicial, the main result of this section is Theorem 3.5, where correctness of the algorithm is proved. A key result for obtaining the algorithm is Proposition 3.2, which asserts that if $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection simplicial toric ideal, then either there exist i, j such that $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$ or $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$. Moreover, if $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection and $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$, then the set $\mathcal{A}'$ provided by Theorem 2.14 determines another complete intersection simplicial toric ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ such that $\operatorname{ht}(I_{\mathcal{A}'}) = \operatorname{ht}(I_{\mathcal{A}}) - 1$. The idea under Algorithm CI-simplicial is to apply Theorem 2.14 as many times as possible, then we have a set $\mathcal{B}$ such that $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is not a complete intersection if $\mathcal{B}_{red} \neq \emptyset$. Nevertheless, if $\mathcal{B}_{red} = \emptyset$ some extra conditions have to be verified in order to determine whether $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection or not. These conditions consist of checking whether some elements belong to certain subsemigroups of $\mathbb{N}^m$. Moreover, as a direct consequence of Proposition 3.2, we get in Corollary 3.4 that a simplicial projective toric ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection if and only if $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$. This result provides a simpler algorithm for determining whether or not a simplicial projective toric ideal is a complete intersection that only consists of computing $\mathcal{A}_{red}$ and checking if $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$.

In Section 4, as non-trivial consequences of Corollary 3.4, when k is an algebraically closed field, we prove in Theorem 4.1 that the only simplicial projective toric variety which is an ideal-theoretic complete intersection is defined parametrically by $x_1 = t_1^2$, $x_2 = t_2^2$, $x_3 = t_1 t_2$. Moreover, in Theorem 4.2, we list all simplicial projective toric varieties having one singular point that are ideal-theoretic complete intersection. Recall that a variety is an ideal-theoretic complete intersection if its defining ideal is a complete intersection.

Finally, in Section 5, we describe the implementation details of the algorithms for determining whether a simplicial projective toric ideal and a simplicial toric ideal is a complete intersection. We have implemented these algorithms in C++ and in SINGULAR. The implementation in SINGULAR gave rise to the distributed library `cisimplicial.lib` [4]. Computational experiments show that our implementation is able to solve large-size instances.

2 Complete intersection toric ideals

In this section $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ denotes a set of nonzero vectors in $\mathbb{N}^m$ and $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ its corresponding toric ideal. The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 2.14, the idea under both results is that, under certain hypothesis, they provide a new set $\mathcal{A}' \subset \mathbb{N}^m$ such that $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ is a complete intersection whenever $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is and $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ is simpler than $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ in some sense.

To present Theorem 2.5 we first need some results. We start with two lemmas that are easy to prove.

Lemma 2.1. *If there exist* $\{\alpha_j\}_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\\ j\neq i}} \subset \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $a_i = \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\\ j\neq i}} \alpha_j a_j$, *then*

(a) $I_{\mathcal{A}} = I_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\{a_i\}} \cdot k[x] + (x_i - \prod_{j\neq i} x_j^{\alpha_j})$

(b) $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *is a complete intersection* $\Longleftrightarrow I_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\{a_i\}}$ *is a complete intersection.*

Lemma 2.2. *Set* $\mathcal{B} := \{a_i \in \mathcal{A} \,|\, a_i \in \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{Q}\, a_j\}$, *then*

(a) $I_{\mathcal{A}} = (0) \Longleftrightarrow \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$

(b) *If* $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$, *then* $I_{\mathcal{A}} = I_{\mathcal{B}} \cdot k[x]$

(c) *If* $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$, *then* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *is a complete intersection* $\Longleftrightarrow I_{\mathcal{B}}$ *is a complete intersection.*

Now, if we assume that $a_i \in \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{Q}\, a_j$ for all $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, we can define

$$B_i := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid b\, a_i \in \textstyle\sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{Z}\, a_j\} \text{ for all } i \in \{1,\ldots,n\},$$

and we obtain the following generalization of Lemma 3.2 in [21] which dealt with toric ideals associated to affine monomial curves.

Proposition 2.3. *Let* $b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ *be a divisor of* B_i *for some* $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ *and set* $\mathcal{A}' := \{a_1,\ldots,a_{i-1}, b\, a_i, a_{i+1},\ldots,a_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}^m$, *then* $\mu(I_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mu(I_{\mathcal{A}'})$. *In particular,* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *is a complete intersection if and only if so is* $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$.

Proof. Consider the morphism $\rho : k[x] \longrightarrow k[x]$ defined by $x_i \mapsto x_i^b$, $x_j \mapsto x_j$ for $j \in \{1,\ldots,n\} \setminus \{i\}$, we claim that

$$I_{\mathcal{A}} = \rho(I_{\mathcal{A}'}) \cdot k[x]. \tag{1}$$

For every binomial $g \in I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ it is straightforward to check that $\rho(g) \in I_{\mathcal{A}}$. Consider $h = x^\alpha - x^\beta \in I_{\mathcal{A}}$, where x^β does not involve the variable x_i, then $\sum \alpha_j a_j = \sum \beta_j a_j$ and $\alpha_i a_i = \sum_{j\neq i}(\beta_j - \alpha_j) a_j$. Thus $\alpha_i \in \{b \in \mathbb{Z} \,|\, b\, a_i \in \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{Z}\, a_j\}$, which equals $\mathbb{Z}B_i$. Therefore $\alpha_i = b\alpha_i'$ with $\alpha_i' \in \mathbb{N}$ and if we set $\alpha' := (\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_{i-1},\alpha_i',\alpha_{i+1},\ldots,\alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, then $h' := x^{\alpha'} - x^\beta \in I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ and $\rho(h') = h$. Since $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ are binomial prime ideals, this proves that for every set $\mathfrak{B}'$ of $\mathcal{A}'$-homogeneous binomials generating $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$, $\rho(\mathfrak{B}')$ generates $I_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Let $\mathfrak{B} = \{h_1,\ldots,h_r\}$ be a set of $\mathcal{A}$-homogeneous binomials generating $I_{\mathcal{A}}$. Proceeding as before, one can find $\mathfrak{B}' := \{h_1',\ldots,h_r'\} \subset I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ such that $\rho(h_j') = h_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq r$. We claim that $\mathfrak{B}'$ generates $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$. Given $g \in I_{\mathcal{A}'}$, then $\rho(g) \in I_{\mathcal{A}}$ and since $\mathrm{Im}(\rho) = k[x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_i^b, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n]$ and $k[x]$ is a free $\mathrm{Im}(\rho)$-module with basis $\{1, x_i, x_i^2, \ldots, x_i^{b-1}\}$, $\rho(g)$ can be written as $\rho(g) = \sum_{i=1}^s q_i h_i = \sum_{i=1}^s q_i \rho(h_i')$ with $q_i \in \mathrm{Im}(\rho)$, then the result follows by the injectivity of ρ. Since $\mathrm{ht}(I_\mathcal{A}) = \mathrm{ht}(I_{\mathcal{A}'})$, $I_\mathcal{A}$ is a complete intersection if and only if so is $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$. □

As a direct consequence of Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 2.3, we get the following result that generalizes those of Şahin [24, Proposition 2.4] and Thoma [26, Theorem 2.1 (1)] for general toric ideals and the one by Watanabe [29, Lemma 1] for 1-dimensional toric ideals.

Corollary 2.4. *Suppose that* $B_i a_i \in \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{N}\, a_j$ *for some* $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. *Then*

$$I_\mathcal{A} \textit{ is a complete intersection} \Longleftrightarrow I_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\{a_i\}} \textit{ is a complete intersection.}$$

Applying Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 and Proposition 2.3 iteratively, we can associate to $\mathcal{A}$ a unique subset $\mathcal{A}_{red} \subset \mathbb{N}^m$ which can be either empty or satisfies that $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \{a_1', \ldots, a_r'\}$, where $r \leq n$, $a_i' \in \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,r\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{Z}\, a_j' \setminus \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,r\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{N}\, a_j'$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. As a consequence of this construction we have the following result.

Theorem 2.5. $I_\mathcal{A}$ *is a complete intersection* $\Longleftrightarrow$ *either* $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$ *or* $I_{\mathcal{A}_{red}}$ *is a complete intersection.*

Corollary 2.6. *If* $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset \Longrightarrow I_\mathcal{A}$ *is a complete intersection.*

Table 1 shows Reduction Algorithm, an algorithm which receives as input the set $\mathcal{A}$ and computes $\mathcal{A}_{red}$.

Remark 2.7. *For arbitrary toric ideals* $I_\mathcal{A}$, *the fact that* $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$ *is not a necessary condition for* $I_\mathcal{A}$ *to be a complete intersection. For example, one can check by means of* [4] *that* $I_\mathcal{A}$ *is a complete intersection, where* $\mathcal{A} = \{14, 15, 20, 21\}$. *Nevertheless, the equality* $14 + 21 = 15 + 20$ *shows that* $a_i \in \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,2,3,4\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{Z}\, a_j$ *for* $1 \leq i \leq 4$, *and* $a_i \notin \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,2,3,4\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{N}\, a_j$ *for all* $1 \leq i \leq 4$, *thus* $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{red}$.

Remark 2.8. *It is worth mentioning that whenever* $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$ *or one knows a minimal set of generators of* $I_{\mathcal{A}_{red}}$, Lemmas 2.1 *and* 2.2 *and* Proposition 2.3 *and its proof show how to obtain a minimal set of generators of* $I_\mathcal{A}$ *formed by binomials.*

Let us illustrate this with an example.

Example 2.9. *Set* $\mathcal{A} := \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5\} \subset \mathbb{N}^3$ *with* $a_1 = (0, 0, 3)$, $a_2 = (2, 3, 12)$, $a_3 = (0, 6, 18)$, $a_4 = (1, 0, 0)$ *and* $a_5 = (1, 5, 17)$. *Let us compute* $\mathcal{A}_{red}$, *first note that we have the following two equalities*

$$3a_5 + a_2 = 3a_1 + 3a_3 + 5a_4 \qquad (1)$$
$$2a_2 = 2a_1 + a_3 + 4a_4 \qquad (2)$$

Reduction Algorithm

Input: $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}^m$
Output: $\mathcal{A}_{red}$

```
$\mathcal{A}_{red} := \mathcal{A}$
repeat
  $G := \mathcal{A}_{red}$
  for all $a \in G$ do
    $\mathcal{A}_{red} := \mathcal{A}_{red} \setminus \{a\}$
    if $a \in \mathbb{Q}\,\mathcal{A}_{red}$ then
      $B := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, b\,a \in \mathbb{Z}\,\mathcal{A}_{red}\}$
      if $B\,a \notin \mathbb{N}\mathcal{A}_{red}$ then
        $\mathcal{A}_{red} := \mathcal{A}_{red} \cup \{B\,a\}$
      end if
    end if
  end for
until $(\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset)$ OR $(\mathcal{A}_{red} = G)$
return $(\mathcal{A}_{red})$
```

Table 1: Pseudo-code for computing $\mathcal{A}_{red}$

First observe that $a_i \in \sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq 5\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{Q}\, a_j$ *and* $a_i \notin \sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq 5\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{N}\, a_j$ *for all* $1 \leq i \leq 5$*. By* (1) *and* (2) *we deduce that* $B_1 = B_2 = B_3 = B_4 = 1$*. In order to compute* B_5*, which is* ≤ 3 *by* (1)*, we observe that* $17B_5 \in \mathbb{Z}\{3, 12, 18\} = \mathbb{Z}\{3\}$ *from the relation* $B_5 a_5 \in \sum_{j=1}^{4} \mathbb{Z}\, a_j$*, so* $B_5 = 3$*.*

Setting $a_6 := 3a_5$ *we observe that* $a_6 = a_1 + a_2 + 2a_3 + a_4 \in \mathbb{N}\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$*, then we write* $\mathcal{A}_1 := \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$*. By* (2) *we have that for all* $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, a_i \in \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,2,3,4\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{Q}\, a_j$*. Now we compute* $B_1' := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid b a_1 \in \sum_{j\in\{2,3,4\}} \mathbb{Z}\, a_j\}$*, by* (2) *we get that* $B_1' \leq 2$ *and observe that* $3B_1' \in \mathbb{Z}\{12, 18\} = \mathbb{Z}\{6\}$ *from the relation* $B_1' a_1 \in \sum_{j\in\{2,3,4\}} \mathbb{Z}\, a_j$*, so* $B_1' = 2$*.*

Next we set $a_7 := 2a_1$ *and observe that* $a_7 \notin \mathbb{N}\{a_2, a_3, a_4\}$*, then we write* $\mathcal{A}_2 := \{a_2, a_3, a_4, a_7\}$*. Now, set* $B_2' := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid b\, a_2 \in \sum_{j\in\{3,4,7\}} \mathbb{Z}\, a_j\}$*. By* (2) *we have that* $B_2' \leq 2$ *and we get that* $3B_2' \in \mathbb{Z}\{6\}$ *from the relation* $B_2' a_2 \in \sum_{j\in\{3,4,7\}} \mathbb{Z}\, a_j$*, so* $B_2' = 2$*.*

Finally we set $a_8 := 2a_2$*, we observe that* $a_8 = a_3 + 4a_4 + a_7 \in \mathbb{N}\{a_3, a_4, a_7\}$*, and write* $\mathcal{A}_3 = \{a_3, a_4, a_7\}$*. Since* a_3, a_4 *and* a_7 *are* $\mathbb{Q}$*-linearly independent, we finally get that* $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$*.*

During the computation of $\mathcal{A}_{red}$*, we had to verify that*

- $a_6 \in \mathbb{N}a_1 + \mathbb{N}a_2 + \mathbb{N}a_3 + \mathbb{N}a_4$ *and we got that* $3a_5 = a_6 = a_1 + 2a_2 + 2a_3 + a_4$*; then we define* $g_1 := x_5^3 - x_1\, x_2^2\, x_3^2\, x_4$
- $a_8 \in \mathbb{N}a_3 + \mathbb{N}a_4 + \mathbb{N}a_7$ *and got that* $2a_2 = a_8 = a_3 + 4a_4 + a_7 = 2a_1 + a_3 + 4a_4$*; then we define* $g_2 := x_2^2 - x_1^2 x_3 x_4^4$

and we finally obtained that $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$*, so we deduce that* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *is a complete intersection minimally generated by* $\{g_1, g_2\}$*.*

Remark 2.10. Bertin *and* Carbonne *in* [6] *introduced the concept of free semigroup for subsemigroups of* $\mathbb{N}$*.* García-Sánchez *and* Rosales *in* [16] *generalized this concept to semigroups of* $\mathbb{N}^m$ *and proved several equivalent definitions for a semigroup to be free. From the results here introduced one can derive that the semigroup spanned by* $\mathcal{A}$ *is free if and only if* $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$*. Thus, one can use* Reduction Algorithm *to determine whether a semigroup is free or not.*

The next objective is to prove Theorem 2.14. In this result, if $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection and some conditions are satisfied, it leads to another toric ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}'} \subset k[x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}]$ which is again a complete intersection and $\mathrm{ht}(I_{\mathcal{A}'}) = \mathrm{ht}(I_{\mathcal{A}}) - 1$. For proving Theorem 2.14 we will use Theorem 1.1 in [18], which is a reformulation of [13, Theorem 2.9], and a technical lemma. Before presenting these results we include some definitions.

Definition 2.11. *Let* B *be an integral matrix.* B *is mixed if every row of* B *contains a positive and a negative entry.* B *is called dominating if it does not contain a square mixed submatrix. For every* $1 \leq t \leq \mathrm{rk}(B)$*,* $\Delta_t(B)$ *denotes de greatest common divisor of all the nonzero* $t \times t$ *minors of* B*.*

We can now formulate Fisher and Shapiro's result.

Theorem 2.12. *([13, Theorem 2.9], [18, Theorem 1.1]) Let* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *be a toric ideal of height* s *and* $g_i = x^{\alpha_i} - x^{\beta_i} \in I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *with* $\gcd(x^{\alpha_i}, x^{\beta_i}) = 1$ *for* $1 \leq i \leq s$*. If* B *denotes the* $s \times n$ *matrix whose* i*-th row is* $\alpha_i - \beta_i$ *for* $1 \leq i \leq s$*, then*

$$I_{\mathcal{A}} = (g_1, \ldots, g_s) \iff B \text{ is dominating and } \Delta_s(B) = 1.$$

The following lemma, whose proof is easy, will be useful in the proof of Theorem 2.14.

Lemma 2.13. *Let* c, d *be two relatively prime positive integers, let* $A = (a_{i,j})$ *be an* $s \times n$ *integral matrix of rank* s *such that*

- $a_{s,j} = 0$ *for* $1 \leq j \leq n-2$, $a_{s,n-1} = c$, $a_{s,n} = -d$, *and*
- $a_{i,n-1}\, a_{i,n} \geq 0$ *for* $1 \leq i \leq s-1$.

and consider the $s-1 \times n-1$ *matrix* $A' = (b_{i,j})$ *defined as*

- $b_{i,j} := a_{i,j}$ *for* $1 \leq i \leq s-1$, $1 \leq j \leq n-2$,
- $b_{i,n-1} := c\, a_{i,n-1} + d\, a_{i,n}$ *for* $1 \leq i \leq s-1$.

Then A *is dominating if and only if so is* A' *and* $\Delta_s(A) = \Delta_{s-1}(A')$*.*

To introduce Theorem 2.14 we need some more definitions. Given a finite set $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{N}^m$, one can associate to $\mathcal{B}$ the rational polyhedral cone

$$\mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{B}) := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i b_i \mid \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R},\ \lambda_i \geq 0,\ b_i \in \mathcal{B} \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \right\}$$

and whenever $a_i \in \mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\})$, then one can define

$$m_i := \min \left\{ b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid b a_i \in \textstyle\sum_{\substack{j \in \{1,\ldots,n\} \\ j \neq i}} \mathbb{N} a_j \right\}.$$

For every $a, b \in \mathbb{N}^m$ satisfying that $a = \lambda b$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$, we denote by $\gcd\{a, b\} \in \mathbb{N}^m$ the vector whose i-th coordinate is 0 if $a_i = b_i = 0$ and $\gcd\{a_i, b_i\}$ otherwise. It is easy to check that $\mathbb{Z}a + \mathbb{Z}b = \mathbb{Z}\gcd\{a, b\}$. Moreover, whenever $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$ for some $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, then $m_i \gcd\{a_i, a_j\} = a_j$ and $m_j \gcd\{a_i, a_j\} = a_i$.

With this notation, we have the following result, which is a generalization of a part of [2, Proposition 2.1] for general toric ideals.

Theorem 2.14. *Let* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *be a complete intersection. Whenever* $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$ *for some* $1 \leq i < j \leq n$*, we have that*

(1) $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ *is a complete intersection, where* $\mathcal{A}' := \{a'_1, \ldots, a'_{n-1}\}$ *with* $a'_r := a_r$ *for* $r \in \{1, \ldots, j-1\} \setminus \{i\}$, $a'_r := a_{r+1}$ *for* $r \in \{j, \ldots, n-1\}$, *and* $a'_i := \gcd\{a_i, a_j\}$

(2) *For every* $a'_r \in \operatorname{Cone}(\mathcal{A}'\backslash\{a'_r\})$*, if we set* $m'_r := \min\left\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid b\, a'_r \in \sum_{\substack{t\in\{1,\ldots,n-1\}\\ t\neq r}} \mathbb{N}\, a'_t\right\}$*, then* $m'_r = m_r$ *if* $r \in \{1,\ldots,j-1\}\setminus\{i\}$ *and* $m'_r = m_{r+1}$ *if* $r \in \{j,\ldots,n-1\}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume that $m_{n-1}a_{n-1} = m_n a_n$. Let us show that $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ is a complete intersection where $\mathcal{A}' = \{a_1,\ldots,a_{n-2},a'_{n-1}\}$ and $a'_{n-1} = \gcd\{a_{n-1},a_n\}$. Since $\mathbb{Z}\,\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}\,\mathcal{A}'$, then $\operatorname{ht}(I_{\mathcal{A}'}) = \operatorname{ht}(I_{\mathcal{A}}) - 1$.

Let $\{g_1,\ldots,g_s\}$ be a minimal set of $\mathcal{A}$-homogeneous binomials generating $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ with $s = \operatorname{ht}(I_{\mathcal{A}})$. Assume that the $\mathcal{A}$-degrees of $g_1,\ldots,g_s$ are $D_1,\ldots,D_s \in \mathbb{N}^m$ respectively. Consider the $\mathcal{A}$-homogeneous binomial $h := x_n^{m_n} - x_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} \in I_{\mathcal{A}}$ of $\mathcal{A}$-degree $m_n a_n = m_{n-1}a_{n-1}$. Hence $h = q_1 g_1 + \ldots + q_s g_s$, where $q_k \in k[x]$ is an $\mathcal{A}$-homogeneous polynomial of $\mathcal{A}$-degree $m_n a_n - D_k \in \mathbb{N}^m$ when $q_k \neq 0$ for all $k \in \{1,\ldots,s\}$. In particular, there exists $i_0 \in \{1,\ldots,s\}$ such that $q_{i_0} \neq 0$ and the image of g_{i_0} under the evaluation morphism which sends x_k to 0 for all $k \neq n$ is equal to x_n^d with $da_n = D_{i_0}$. We will assume that $i_0 = s$, thus $g_s = x_n^d - x^\alpha$, where x^α is a monomial of $\mathcal{A}$-degree D_s which does not involve the variable x_n, and hence $D_s = da_n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ a_n \cap \sum_{j\in\{1,\ldots,n-1\}} \mathbb{N}\, a_j$. By the definition of m_n we get the equality $m_n = d$ and $\deg_{\mathcal{A}}(q_s) = 0$. Hence $q_s \in k$ and $\{g_1,\ldots,g_{s-1},h\}$ is a minimal set of $\mathcal{A}$-homogeneous binomial generators of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Now, if we write $g_i := x^{\alpha_i} - x^{\beta_i}$ and $\gamma_i := \alpha_i - \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ for all $i \in \{1,\ldots,s-1\}$ and $\gamma_s := -m_{n-1}e_{n-1} + m_n e_n$ and let A be the $s\times n$ matrix whose i-th row is γ_i for all $i \in \{1,\ldots,s\}$, then by Theorem 2.12, A is dominating and $\Delta_s(A) = 1$. In particular, we have that $\gamma_{in-1}\gamma_{in} \geq 0$ for all $i \in \{1,\ldots,s-1\}$; otherwise, there exists $i \in \{1,\ldots,s-1\}$ such that $\gamma_{in-1}\gamma_{in} < 0$ and the 2×2 submatrix of A formed by the rows i and s and the columns $n-1$ and n is mixed, which contradicts that A is dominating.

Consider now the morphism $\psi : k[x] \longrightarrow k[x_1,\ldots,x_{n-1}]$ defined by $x_{n-1} \mapsto x_{n-1}^{m_n}$, $x_n \mapsto x_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}}$ and $x_i \mapsto x_i$ for $i \in \{1,\ldots,n-2\}$. If we set $J := \psi(I_{\mathcal{A}})\cdot k[x_1,\ldots,x_{n-1}]$, since $\psi(h) = 0$, we have that $J = (\psi(g_1),\ldots,\psi(g_{s-1}))$ and it is easy to check that $J \subset I_{\mathcal{A}'}$.

Write $\psi(g_i) := x^{\lambda_i} - x^{\mu_i}$ and $\rho_i := \lambda_i - \mu_i \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$ for al $i \in \{1,\ldots,s-1\}$ and consider A' the $(s-1)\times(n-1)$ integral matrix whose i-th row is ρ_i for all $i \in \{1,\ldots,s-1\}$. By construction, for each $i \in \{1,\ldots,s-1\}$ we have that $\rho_{ij} = \gamma_{ij}$ for all $j \in \{1,\ldots,n-2\}$ and $\rho_{in-1} = m_n\gamma_{in-1} + m_{n-1}\gamma_{in}$. By definition $\gcd\{m_{n-1},m_n\} = 1$ and by Lemma 2.13 it follows that A' is dominating and $\Delta_{s-1}(A') = \Delta_s(A) = 1$. Thus, by Theorem 2.12, we have that

$$I_{\mathcal{A}'} = (\psi(g_1),\ldots,\psi(g_{s-1})), \tag{2}$$

hence $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ is a complete intersection.

In accordance with our previous assumptions, let us now show that $m_i = m'_i$ for all $a_i \in \operatorname{Cone}(\mathcal{A}\setminus\{a_i\})$, where $m'_i = \min\left\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid ba_i \in \sum_{j\in\{1,\ldots,n-2\}\setminus\{i\}} \mathbb{N}\, a_j + \mathbb{N}\, a'_{n-1}\right\}$. Observe that for all $i \in \{1,\ldots,n-2\}$ the inequality $m_i \geq m'_i$ is obvious because $a_{n-1},\, a_n \in \mathbb{N}\, a'_{n-1}$. Let $\{b_{(i,j)}\}_{j\in\{1,\ldots,n-1\}\setminus\{i\}}$ be a family of nonnegative integers such that $m'_i a_i = \sum_{j\in\{1,\ldots,n-2\}\setminus\{i\}} b_{(i,j)}a_j + b_{(i,n-1)}a'_{n-1}$.

Consequently, the $\mathcal{A}'$-homogeneous polynomial $f := x_i^{m'_i} - \prod_{j\neq i} x_j^{b_{(i,j)}}$ of $\mathcal{A}'$-degree $m'_i a_i$ belongs to $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ and hence $f = q_{(i,1)}\psi(g_1) + \ldots + q_{(i,s-1)}\psi(g_{s-1})$, where $q_{(i,j)} \in k[x_1,\ldots,x_{n-1}]$

is either 0 or an $\mathcal{A}'$-homogeneous polynomial of $\mathcal{A}'$-degree $m_i' a_i - \deg_{\mathcal{A}'}(\psi(g_i)) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, s-1\}$.

In particular, there exists $k(i) \in \{1, \ldots, s-1\}$ such that $q_{(i\,,k(i))} \neq 0$ and the image of $\psi(g_{k(i)})$ under the evaluation morphism which sends x_j to 0 for all $j \neq i$ is equal to $x_i^{d_i}$, so $m_i' \geq d_i$. Thus $g_{k(i)} = x_i^{d_i} - x^{\alpha}$, where x^{α} is a monomial of $\mathcal{A}$-degree $d_i a_i$ which does not involve the variable x_i, and hence $d_i a_i \in \sum_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n\} \setminus \{i\}} \mathbb{N}\, a_j$, then $m_i' \geq d_i \geq m_i$ and the proof is complete. □

3 Complete intersection simplicial toric ideals

In this section we study the property of being a complete intersection in simplicial toric ideals. More precisely, we focus on the design of Algorithm CI-simplicial, an algorithm for checking if a simplicial toric ideal is a complete intersection. This algorithm arises as a consequence of the convenient application of Theorems 2.5 and 2.14 to the simplicial context together with Proposition 3.2, which is a specific result for simplicial toric ideals.

For obtaining the algorithm, we first introduce the notion of *critical binomial.* Critical binomials were introduced by Eliahou [11] and later studied by Alcntar and Villarreal [1] in the context of toric ideals associated to affine monomial curves, here we extend this concept to arbitrary toric ideals in a natural way.

Definition 3.1. *For every* $a_i \in \mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\})$*, a binomial*

$$f_i = x_i^{m_i} - \prod_{j \neq i} x_j^{\beta_{ij}} \in I_{\mathcal{A}}$$

is called a critical binomial with respect to x_i*.*

The next result relates critical binomials and complete intersection simplicial toric ideals.

Proposition 3.2. *Let* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *be a simplicial toric ideal such that for every* a_i, a_j *with* $a_i \in \mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\})$ *and* $a_j \in \mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_j\})$ *with* $i \neq j$ *we have that* $m_i a_i \neq m_j a_j$*. The following are equivalent:*

(a) $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *is a complete intersection*

(b) *for every set* $\{f_{m+1}, \ldots, f_n\}$ *such that* f_i *is a critical binomial with respect to* x_i *for* $m+1 \leq i \leq n$*, then* $I_{\mathcal{A}} = (f_{m+1}, \ldots, f_n)$

(c) $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$

Proof. (b) ⇒ (a) is obvious. (a) ⇒ (b). Let $\{g_1, \ldots, g_{n-m}\}$ be a set of $\mathcal{A}$-homogeneous binomials generating $I_{\mathcal{A}}$. Take $i \in \{m+1, \ldots, n\}$, and f_i a critical binomial with respect to x_i, if we proceed as in the proof of Theorem 2.14 we get that there exists $k(i) \in \{1, \ldots, n-m\}$ such that $g_{k(i)}$ (or $-g_{k(i)}$) is a critical binomial with respect to x_i and $I_{\mathcal{A}} = (g_1, \ldots, g_{k(i)-1}, g_{k(i)+1}, \ldots, g_{n-m}, f_i)$. Repeating this argument, we get that $I_{\mathcal{A}} = (f_{m+1}, \ldots, f_n)$.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (c). Let f_i be a critical binomial with respect to x_i for $m+1 \leq i \leq n$ and let us prove that there exists $j \in \{m+1, \dots, n\}$ such that x_j does not appear in f_k for all $k \in \{m+1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{j\}$. Suppose this claim is false, then if we define the simple directed graph with vertex set $\{m+1, \dots, n\}$ and arc set $\{(j,k) \,|\, m+1 \leq j,\ k \leq n,\ j \neq k$ and x_j appears in $f_k\}$, it is clear that the out-degree of every vertex is greater or equal to one, this implies that there is a cycle in the graph. Suppose, without loss of generality, that the cycle is $(m+1, m+2, \dots, m+k, m+1)$ with $k \leq n-m$, this means that $(f_{m+1}, \dots, f_{m+k}) \subset (x_{m+1}, \dots, x_{m+k})$, so $I_{\mathcal{A}} \subsetneq H := (x_{m+1}, \dots, x_{m+k}, f_{m+k+1}, \dots, f_n)$ but this is not possible due to $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is prime and $n - m = \mathrm{ht}(I_{\mathcal{A}}) < \mathrm{ht}(H) \leq n - m$.

Thus there exists $i \in \{m+1, \dots, n\}$ such that x_i only appears in f_i, suppose $i = n$. Now we write $f_j = x_j^{m_j} - x^{\alpha_j}$ and $\gamma_j := m_j e_j - \alpha_j \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ for all $j \in \{m+1, \dots, n\}$. By [12, Proposition 2.3], $\{\gamma_{m+1}, \dots, \gamma_n\}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis for the kernel of the homomorphism $\tau : \mathbb{Z}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^m$ induced by $\tau(e_j) = a_j$. By definition, $B_n a_n = \sum_{j \neq n} \beta_j a_j$ for some $\beta_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, so take $\delta := B_n e_n - \sum_{j \neq i} \beta_j e_j$, then $\delta \in \ker(\tau)$ and $\gamma_{jn} = 0$ for all $j \in \{m+1, \dots, n-1\}$. Consequently $\gamma_{nn} = m_n$ divides B_n and by definition B_n divides m_n, so $B_n a_n = m_n a_n \in \sum_{j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}} \mathbb{N} a_j$. Now, by Corollary 2.4, it follows that $I_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_n\}}$ is a complete intersection and it is minimally generated by $\{f_{m+1}, \dots, f_{n-1}\}$ which are again critical binomials in $I_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_n\}}$; repeating the same argument we conclude that $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$. Finally, (c) $\Rightarrow$ (a) by Corollary 2.6. $\square$

Remark 3.3. *The condition of being a simplicial toric ideal in this* Proposition *is essential to obtain the result. To show this, consider the toric ideal* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$*, where* $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5\} \subset \mathbb{N}^3$ *with* $a_1 = (0,2,2)$, $a_2 = (4,2,2)$, $a_3 = (2,2,2)$, $a_4 = (1,3,2)$ *and* $a_5 = (1,1,2)$. $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *is a height* 2 *complete intersection toric ideal minimally generated by* $g_1 := x_3^2 - x_1 x_2$ *and* $g_2 := x_1 x_3 - x_4 x_5$*. However, only for* $i = 3$ *we have that* $a_i \in \mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\})$ *and from the relations* $2a_3 = a_1 + a_2$ *and* $a_1 + a_3 = a_4 + a_5$ *one can derive that* $B_i = 1$ *and it is easy to check that* $B_i a_i = a_i \notin \sum_{\substack{j \in \{1,2,3,4,5\} \\ j \neq i}} \mathbb{N} a_j$ *for all* $i \in \{1,2,3,4,5\}$*, thus* $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{red} \neq \emptyset$.

As a direct consequence of Proposition 3.2, one gets the following.

Corollary 3.4. *Let* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *be a simplicial projective toric ideal. Then,*

$$I_{\mathcal{A}} \text{ is a complete intersection} \Longleftrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset.$$

This result yields an effective method for determining whether a simplicial projective toric ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection. Moreover, by Remark 2.8, in case a simplicial projective toric ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection, while checking that $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$ one gets without extra effort a minimal set of generators of the toric ideal formed by binomials.

Now we proceed with the main result.

Theorem 3.5. *Let* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *be a simplicial toric ideal,* Algorithm CI-simplicial *determines whether* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *is a complete intersection or not.*

For proving correctness of Algorithm CI-simplicial, we need a technical lemma.

```
Algorithm CI-simplicial

        Input:   $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}^m$, where $\{d_1e_1, \ldots, d_me_m\} \subset \mathcal{A}$
        Output:  TRUE or FALSE

$G := \mathcal{A}$
$V_i := \{a_i\}, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$
$m_i := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid ba_i \in \mathbb{N}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\})\}$ for all $a_i \in \mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\})$.
$k := 0$
while $\exists\, a_i, a_j \in G$ such that $m_ia_i = m_ja_j$ do
  if $m_ia_i \notin \mathbb{N}V_i \cap \mathbb{N}V_j$ then
    return FALSE
  end if
  $k := k + 1$; $a_{n+k} := \gcd\{a_i, a_j\}$; $V_{n+k} := V_i \cup V_j$; $G := G \setminus \{a_i, a_j\} \cup \{a_{n+k}\}$
  if $a_{n+k} \in \mathrm{Cone}(G \setminus \{a_{n+k}\})$ then
    $m_{n+k} := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid ba_{n+k} \in \mathbb{N}(G \setminus \{a_{n+k}\})\}$
  end if
end while
$\mathcal{B} := G$
repeat
  $G := \mathcal{B}$
  for all $a_i \in G$ do
    if $a_i \notin \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{B}$ then
      $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B} \setminus \{a_i\}$
    else
      $B_i := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid ba_i \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{B} \setminus \{a_i\})\}$
      if $B_ia_i \in \mathbb{N}V_i \cap \sum_{a_j \in (\mathcal{B} \setminus \{a_i\})} \mathbb{N}V_j$ then
        $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B} \setminus \{a_i\}$
      end if
    end if
  end for
until $(\mathcal{B} = \emptyset)$ OR $(\mathcal{B} = G)$
if $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$ then
  return FALSE
end if
return TRUE
```

Table 2: Pseudo-code for checking whether a simplicial toric ideal is a complete intersection

Lemma 3.6. *Let* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *be a complete intersection toric ideal. Assume that* $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$ *for some* $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ *and set* $\mathcal{A}' := (\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i, a_j\}) \cup \{a_{n+1}\}$*, where* $a_{n+1} := \gcd\{a_i, a_j\}$*. Let* V' *be a proper subset of* $\mathcal{A}'$ *such that* $\sum_{a_k \in V'} \mathbb{Z} a_k = \mathbb{Z} a$ *for some* $a \in \operatorname{Cone}(\mathcal{A}' \setminus V')$ *and consider* $M := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid ba \in \sum_{a_k \in \mathcal{A}' \setminus V'} \mathbb{N} a_k\}$*. If* $Ma \in \mathbb{N} V'$*, then* $Ma \in \mathbb{N} V \cap \mathbb{N}(\mathcal{A} \setminus V)$*, where* $V = V'$ *if* $a_{n+1} \notin V'$*, or* $V = (V' \setminus \{a_{n+1}\}) \cup \{a_i, a_j\}$ *otherwise.*

Proof. Assume that $i = n-1$ and $j = n$, by Theorem 2.14 we have that $I_{\mathcal{A}'} \subset k[x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}]$ is a complete intersection. Moreover, by (2) in the proof of Theorem 2.14 if we denote by ψ the morphism $\psi : k[x] \longrightarrow k[x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}]$ such that $\psi(x_i) = x_i$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-2\}$, $\psi(x_{n-1}) = x_{n-1}^{m_n}$, $\psi(x_n) = x_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}}$; then there exist $s = \operatorname{ht}(I_{\mathcal{A}'})$ binomials $g_1, \ldots, g_s \in I_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $I_{\mathcal{A}'} = (\psi(g_1), \ldots, \psi(g_s)) \subset k[x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}]$.

We have that $Ma = \sum_{a_u \in V'} \gamma_u a_u = \sum_{a_v \in \mathcal{A}' \setminus V'} \gamma_v a_v$, then we write $\alpha := \sum_{a_u \in V'} \gamma_u e_u$, $\beta := \sum_{a_v \in \mathcal{A}' \setminus V'} \gamma_v e_v$ and the binomial $h := x^\alpha - x^\beta$ belongs to $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$. Thus $h = q_1 \psi(g_1) + \cdots + q_s \psi(g_s)$, where q_t is either the null polynomial or $\mathcal{A}'$-homogeneous of $\mathcal{A}'$-degree $Ma - \deg_{\mathcal{A}'}(\psi(g_t)) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ for $1 \leq t \leq s$.

Consider the evaluation morphism $\Phi : k[x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}] \longrightarrow k[x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}]$ induced by $x_k \mapsto 0$ for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $a_k \notin V$. Then, $x^\alpha = \Phi(q_1)\Phi(\psi(g_1)) + \cdots + \Phi(q_s)\Phi(\psi(g_s))$ and there exist $i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$ and some integers $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{n-2}, \lambda_{n+1} \geq 0$ and $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{n-2}, \delta_{n+1} \geq 0$ verifying:

- $\Phi(q_{i_0}) \neq 0$,
- $\psi(g_{i_0}) = x_1^{\lambda_1} \cdots x_{n-2}^{\lambda_{n-2}} x_{n-1}^{\lambda_{n+1}} - x_1^{\delta_1} \cdots x_{n-2}^{\delta_{n-2}} x_{n-1}^{\delta_{n+1}}$,
- $\lambda_r = 0$ if $a_r \notin V'$ for every $r \in \{1, \ldots, n-2, n+1\}$, and
- $\delta_s \neq 0$ for some $s \in \{1, \ldots, n-2, n+1\}$ such that $a_s \notin V$.

Thus, Ma is componentwise $\geq$ than $\lambda_1 a_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{n-2} a_{n-2} + \lambda_{n+1} a_{n+1} = \delta_1 a_1 + \cdots + \delta_{n-2} a_{n-2} + \delta_{n+1} a_{n+1}$, and $Ma - \sum_{a_u \in V'} \delta_u a_u$ is componentwise $\geq$ than $\lambda_1 a_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{n-2} a_{n-2} + \lambda_{n+1} a_{n+1} - \sum_{a_u \in V'} \delta_u a_u = \delta_1 a_1 + \cdots + \delta_{n-2} a_{n-2} + \delta_{n+1} a_{n+1} - \sum_{a_u \in V'} \delta_u a_u$, which belongs to

$$\mathbb{Z}^+ a \bigcap \sum_{a_u \in \mathcal{A}' \setminus V'} \mathbb{N}\, a_u.$$

By definition of M, we have in particular that $\delta_u = 0$ for every $a_u \in V'$ and $Ma = \deg_{\mathcal{A}'}(\psi(g_{i_0})) = \deg_{\mathcal{A}}(g_{i_0})$.

If $a_{n+1} \in V'$, then $g_{i_0} = x_1^{\lambda_1} \cdots x_{n-2}^{\lambda_{n-2}} x_{n-1}^{\lambda'_{n-1}} x_n^{\lambda'_n} - x_1^{\delta_1} \cdots x_{n-2}^{\delta_{n-2}}$, where $\lambda'_{n-1}, \lambda'_n$ are nonnegative integers satisfying that $\lambda'_{n-1} a_{n-1} + \lambda'_n a_n = \lambda_{n+1} a_{n+1}$. As a consequence, $Ma = \lambda_1 a_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{n-2} a_{n-2} + \lambda'_{n-1} a_{n-1} + \lambda'_n a_n \in \mathbb{N} V$.

If $a_{n+1} \notin V'$, then $g_{i_0} = x_1^{\lambda_1} \cdots x_{n-2}^{\lambda_{n-2}} - x_1^{\delta_1} \cdots x_{n-2}^{\delta_{n-2}} x_{n-1}^{\delta'_{n-1}} x_n^{\delta'_n}$, where δ'_{n-1}, δ'_n are nonnegative integers satisfying that $\delta'_{n-1} a_{n-1} + \delta'_n a_n = \delta_{n+1} a_{n+1}$. As a consequence, $Ma = \delta_1 a_1 + \cdots + \delta_{n-2} a_{n-2} + \delta'_{n-1} a_{n-1} + \delta'_n a_n \in \mathbb{N}(\mathcal{A} \setminus V)$. □

Now we can proceed with the proof of Theorem 3.5.

Proof. The algorithm always terminates, so we have to prove that CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$) $=$ TRUE if and only if $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection.

If $m_i a_i \neq m_j a_j$ whenever $a_i \in \mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\}), a_j \in \mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_j\})$, $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, then the algorithm does not enter the **while** loop, thus one can observe that CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$) $=$ TRUE if and only if $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$. By Proposition 3.2 this is equivalent to $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection. Then it remains to prove the result when there exist a_i, a_j such that $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$, we assume that $m_{n-1} a_{n-1} = m_n a_n$.

Suppose that CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$) $=$ TRUE and let us prove that $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection. In particular, when the algorithm returns TRUE, we show how one can construct a set $\mathfrak{B}$ of $n-m$ binomials generating $I_{\mathcal{A}}$. We begin with $\mathfrak{B} := \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{C} := \emptyset$. While running the **while** loop, whenever there exist $a_i, a_j \in G$ such that $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$, then $m_i a_i \in \mathbb{N} V_i \cap \mathbb{N} V_j$ (otherwise CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$) $=$ FALSE), so there exist $\{\gamma_s \,|\, a_s \in V_i\}$ and $\{\gamma_r \,|\, a_r \in V_j\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $m_i a_i = \sum_{a_s \in V_i} \gamma_s a_s = \sum_{a_r \in V_j} \gamma_r a_r$ and we set

$$\alpha := \sum_{a_s \in V_i} \gamma_s e_s \in \mathbb{N}^m,\ \beta := \sum_{a_r \in V_j} \gamma_r e_r \in \mathbb{N}^m,$$

$\mathfrak{B} := \mathfrak{B} \cup \{x^\alpha - x^\beta\}$ and $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C} \cup \{\alpha - \beta\}$. While running the **repeat** loop, whenever $B_i a_i \in \mathbb{N} V_i \cap \sum_{a_j \in \mathcal{A}_{red} \setminus \{a_i\}} \mathbb{N} V_j$, there exists $\{\gamma_s \,|\, a_s \in V_i\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ and for every $a_j \in \mathcal{A}_{red}$ there exists $\{\gamma_r \,|\, a_r \in V_j\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $B_i a_i = \sum_{a_s \in V_i} \gamma_s a_s = \sum_{a_j \in \mathcal{A}_{red} \setminus \{a_i\}} (\sum_{a_r \in V_j} \gamma_r a_r)$, and we set

$$\alpha := \sum_{a_s \in V_i} \gamma_s e_s \in \mathbb{N}^n,\ \beta := \sum_{a_j \in \mathcal{A}_{red} \setminus \{a_i\}} \left(\sum_{a_r \in V_j} \gamma_r e_r \right) \in \mathbb{N}^n,$$

$\mathfrak{B} := \mathfrak{B} \cup \{x^\alpha - x^\beta\}$ and $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C} \cup \{\alpha - \beta\}$.

We claim that at the end of the algorithm $\mathfrak{B}$ is a set of $n-m$ $\mathcal{A}$-homogeneous binomials generating $I_{\mathcal{A}}$; more precisely, we will prove by induction that $\mathfrak{B}$ has exactly $n-m$ elements and the integral $(n-m) \times n$ matrix A whose rows are the elements of $\mathcal{C}$ is mixed dominating and $\Delta_{n-m}(A) = 1$. By Theorem 2.12 this implies that $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection minimally generated by $\mathfrak{B}$.

Since $m_{n-1} a_{n-1} = m_n a_n \in \mathbb{N} V_{n-1} \cap \mathbb{N} V_n$, during the execution of CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$) we set $\mathfrak{B} := \{x_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} - x_n^{m_n}\}$, $\mathcal{C} := \{\delta_1 := m_{n-1} e_{n-1} - m_n e_n\}$, $a_{n+1} := \gcd\{a_{n-1}, a_n\}$, $V_{n+1} := \{a_{n-1}, a_n\}$ and $G := \{a_1, \ldots, a_{n-2}, a_{n+1}\}$. If $n = m+1$, the elements in G are linearly independent; thus δ_1 is the only vector constructed during the execution of the algorithm. So the $1 \times n$ matrix whose unique row is δ_1 is mixed dominating and $\Delta_1(A) = \gcd\{m_{n-1}, m_n\} = 1$.

Assuming the result holds for $n-1$, we prove it for n. During the execution of CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$), we obtain $\mathcal{C} := \{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ where $\delta_1 = m_{n-1} e_{n-1} - m_n e_n$ and $\delta_{i\,n-1} \delta_{i\,n} \geq 0$ for every $i \in \{2, \ldots, k\}$, this is because at any step of the algorithm, if $j < n$, then $a_{n-1} \in V_j$ if and only if $a_n \in V_j$. For every $i \in \{2, \ldots, k\}$ we denote by δ_i' the image of δ_i under the morphism $\sigma : \mathbb{Z}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$ induced by $e_j \mapsto e_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n-2\}$, $e_{n-1} \mapsto m_n e_{n-1}$ and $e_n \mapsto m_{n-1} e_{n-1}$. Since $m_{n-1} a_{n-1}' = a_n$ and $m_n a_{n-1}' = a_{n-1}$, if we run the algorithm with $\{a_1, \ldots, a_{n-2}, a_{n+1}\}$ as input we will obtain TRUE and the set $\mathcal{C}' = \{\delta_2', \ldots, \delta_k'\}$; thus by induction hypothesis we get that $k = n - m$ and the $(n-m-1) \times (n-1)$ matrix A' whose i-th row is δ_i' is mixed dominating and $\Delta_{n-m-1}(A') = 1$. By Lemma 2.13 it follows that A is mixed dominating and $\Delta_{n-m}(A) = \Delta_{n-m-1}(A') = 1$, thus $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection.

Suppose that $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection simplicial toric ideal, we will prove that CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$) = TRUE by induction on n. If $n = m+1$ and $m_{n-1}a_{n-1} = m_n a_n$, then CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$) = TRUE. Assuming the result holds for every $n-1$, we prove it for n. When running CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$), we set $G := \mathcal{A}$, $V_i := \{a_i\}$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $m_i := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, ba_i \in \mathbb{N}\,(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\})\}$ for every $a_i \in \mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\})$.

Since $m_{n-1}a_{n-1} = m_n a_n \in \mathbb{N}a_{n-1} \cap \mathbb{N}a_n$, we denote $a_{n+1} := \gcd\{a_{n-1}, a_n\}$, $G := G \setminus \{a_{n-1}, a_n\}$, $V_{n+1} := \{a_{n-1}, a_n\}$, $G := G \cup \{a_{n+1}\}$ and, if $a_{n+1} \in \mathrm{Cone}(G \setminus \{a_{n+1}\})$, then

$$m_{n+1} := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, ba_{n+1} \in \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \mathbb{N}\, a_i\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{A}'$ be the set $\{a_1, \ldots, a_{n-2}, a_{n+1}\}$, by Theorem 2.14 we have that $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ is a complete intersection simplicial toric ideal. By induction hypothesis CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}'$) = TRUE. When running CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}'$), we first get

- $G' := \mathcal{A}' = G$
- $V_i' := \{a_i\}$, for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-2, n+1\}$,
- $m_i' := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, ba_i \in \sum_{\substack{j \in \{1,\ldots,n-2,n+1\} \\ j \neq i}} \mathbb{N}\, a_j\}$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-2, n+1\}$ such that $a_i \in \mathrm{Cone}(G' \setminus \{a_i\})$.

For every $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-2\}$ we have that $V_i = V_i'$ and if $a_i \in \mathrm{Cone}(G' \setminus \{a_i\})$, then $m_i = m_i'$ by Proposition 2.14, if $a_{n+1} \in \mathrm{Cone}(G' \setminus \{a_{n+1}\})$, then $m_{n+1}' = m_{n+1}$ by definition.

From now on, we continue the execution of CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$) and CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}'$) simultaneously. In the simultaneous execution we have that $G' = G$ and as a consequence $m_i' = m_i$, $V_i = V_i'$ if $a_{n+1} \notin V_i$ and $V_i = (V_i' \setminus \{a_{n+1}\}) \cup \{a_{n-1}, a_n\}$ if $a_{n+1} \in V_i'$. Let us prove that in every execution of the **while** loop, whenever $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$, then $m_i a_i \in \mathbb{N}\, V_i$. Since CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}'$) = TRUE, whenever $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$, we have that $m_i a_i \in \mathbb{N}\, V_i'$. If $a_{n+1} \notin V_i'$, then $V_i' = V_i$ and obviously $m_i a_i \in \mathbb{N}\, V_i$. If $a_{n+1} \in V_i'$, then $V_j' = V_j$ and $m_i a_i = m_j a_j \in \mathbb{N}V_j$, so

$$m_i = \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, ba_i \in \textstyle\sum_{a_u \in \mathcal{A}' \setminus V_i'} \mathbb{N}\, a_u\}.$$

Thus by Lemma 3.6 with $M = m_i$, we have that $m_i a_i \in \mathbb{N}\, V_i$. Analogously, we get that $m_j a_j \in \mathbb{N}\, V_j$.

Now we study the **repeat** loop, in the simultaneous execution we have that $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B}$, so for every $a_i \in \mathcal{B}$ we have that $B_i' = B_i$. The only thing to prove is that if $B_i a_i \in \mathbb{N}V_i' \cap \sum_{a_j \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{N}V_j'$, then $B_i a_i \in \mathbb{N}V_i \cap \sum_{a_j \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{N}V_j$

Note that in every repetition of this loop, if we denote $\mathcal{C} := \cup_{a_j \in \mathcal{B}} V_j$, then by Corollary 2.4 and Proposition 2.14 we have that $I_{\mathcal{C}} \subset k[x_i \,|\, a_i \in \mathcal{C}]$ is a complete intersection. Moreover, if $a_{n-1}, a_n \notin \mathcal{C}$, then $V_i' = V_i$ for every $a_i \in \mathcal{B}$ and it easily follows that CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$) = TRUE. In case a_{n-1}, $a_n \in \mathcal{C}$, we set $\tilde{m}_i := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, ba_i \in \sum_{a_r \in \mathcal{C}\setminus\{a_i\}} \mathbb{N}\, a_r\}$ for $i = n-1$ and $i = n$ and have that $\tilde{m}_{n-1}\, a_{n-1} = \tilde{m}_n\, a_n$ because $m_{n-1}a_{n-1} = m_n a_n$. If $B_i a_i \in \mathbb{N}\, V_i{}' \cap \sum_{a_j \in (\mathcal{B}\,'\setminus\{a_i\})} \mathbb{N}\, V_j' = \sum_{a_s \in V_i{}'} \mathbb{N}\, a_s \cap \sum_{a_r \in \mathcal{C}\,'\setminus V_i{}'} \mathbb{N}\, a_r$, then

$$B_i = \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, ba_i \in \textstyle\sum_{a_r \in \mathcal{C}\,'\setminus V_i{}'} \mathbb{N}\, a_r\}.$$

By Lemma 3.6 with $M = B_i$ it follows that $B_i a_i \in \mathbb{N}V_i$ and that $B_i a_i \in \sum_{a_j \in \mathcal{C}\setminus V_i} \mathbb{N}\, a_j = \sum_{a_j \in (\mathcal{B}\setminus\{a_i\})} \mathbb{N}\, V_j$. Thus, we conclude that CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$) = TRUE. ☐

As observed in the proof of Theorem 3.5, whenever a simplicial toric ideal $I_\mathcal{A}$ is a complete intersection, the algorithm also obtains without any extra effort a minimal set of $\mathcal{A}$-homogeneous binomials generating $I_\mathcal{A}$. Let us illustrate how the algorithm works with an example.

Example 3.7. *Let us prove by means of* Algorithm CI-simplicial *that $I_\mathcal{A}$ is a complete intersection, where $\mathcal{A} := \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6, a_7, a_8\} \subset \mathbb{N}^3$ with $a_1 := (52, 0, 0)$, $a_2 := (0, 52, 0)$, $a_3 := (0, 0, 52)$, $a_4 := (20, 30, 100)$, $a_5 := (28, 42, 140)$, $a_6 := (30, 45, 150)$, $a_7 := (42, 63, 210)$ and $a_8 := (52, 52, 78)$.*

We begin setting $G := \mathcal{A}$ and $V_i = \{a_i\}$ for $1 \le i \le 8$. Firstly we observe that $a_i \in$ $\mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\})$ if and only if $4 \le i \le 8$, thus we compute m_i for $4 \le i \le 8$ and we get that

$$m_4 = 3,\ m_5 = 3,\ m_6 = 2,\ m_7 = 2 \text{ and } m_8 = 2.$$

We observe that $3a_4 = m_4 a_4 = m_6 a_6 = 2a_6$. Thus, we set $g_1 := x_4^3 - x_6^2$, $a_9 := \gcd\{a_4, a_6\} = (10, 15, 50)$ and $G := G \setminus \{a_4, a_6\} = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_5, a_7, a_8\}$. Since $a_9 \in \mathrm{Cone}(G)$, we also set

$$m_9 := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, ba_9 \in \textstyle\sum_{i\in\{1,2,3,5,7,8\}} \mathbb{N}a_i\} = 7,$$

$V_9 := V_4 \cup V_6 = \{a_4, a_6\}$ and $G := G \cup \{a_9\} = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_5, a_7, a_8, a_9\}$.

We observe that $3a_5 = m_5 a_5 = m_7 a_7 = 2a_7$. Thus, we set $g_2 := x_5^3 - x_7^2$, $a_{10} := \gcd\{a_5, a_7\} = (14, 21, 70)$ and $G := (G \setminus \{a_5, a_7\}) = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_8, a_9\}$. Since $a_{10} \in \mathrm{Cone}(G)$, we also set

$$m_{10} := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, ba_{10} \in \textstyle\sum_{i\in\{1,2,3,8,9\}} \mathbb{N}a_i\} = 5,$$

$V_{10} := V_5 \cup V_7 = \{a_5, a_7\}$ and $G := G \cup \{a_{10}\} = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_8, a_9, a_{10}\}$.

We observe that $7a_9 = m_9 a_9 = m_{10} a_{10} = 5a_{10}$ and check that $7a_9 = 2a_4 + a_6 = a_5 + a_7 \in \mathbb{N}V_9 \cap \mathbb{N}V_{10}$. Thus, we set $g_3 := x_4^2 x_6 - x_5 x_7$, $a_{11} := \gcd\{a_9, a_{10}\} = (2, 3, 10)$ and $G := G \setminus \{a_9, a_{10}\} = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_8\}$. Since $a_{11} \in \mathrm{Cone}(G)$, we also set

$$m_{11} := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, ba_{11} \in \textstyle\sum_{i\in\{1,2,3,8\}} \mathbb{N}a_i\} = 52,$$

$V_{11} := V_9 \cup V_{10} = \{a_4, a_5, a_6, a_7\}$ and $G := G \cup \{a_{11}\} = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_8, a_{11}\}$.

For every $a_i, a_j \in G$, one has that $m_i a_i \neq m_j a_j$, then we set $\mathcal{B} := G$. We denote $B_i := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, ba_i \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{B} \setminus \{a_i\})\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 8, 11\}$, we get that $B_{11} = 52$. We observe that

$$B_{11}a_{11} = a_4 + 2a_7 \in \mathbb{N}V_{11} \text{ and that } B_{11}a_{11} = a_2 + 7a_3 + 2a_8 \in \textstyle\bigcup_{i \in \{1,2,3,8\}} \mathbb{N}V_i,$$

thus we set $g_4 := x_4x_7^2 - x_2x_3^7x_8^2$ *and* $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B} \setminus \{a_{11}\}$.

Denoting $B'_i := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, ba_i \in \mathbb{Z}(G \setminus \{a_i\})\}$ *for* $i = 1, 2, 3, 8$, *we get that* $B'_8 = 2$. *We observe that*

$$B'_8a_8 = 2a_8 \in \mathbb{N}V_8 \text{ and that } B'_8a_8 = 2a_1 + a_2 + 3a_3 \in \textstyle\bigcup_{i \in \{1,2,3\}} \mathbb{N}V_i,$$

thus we set $g_5 := x_8^2 - x_1^2x_2x_3^3$ *and* $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B} \setminus \{a_8\}$.

Since $\mathcal{B} = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ *and* a_1, a_2 *and* a_3 *are linearly independent, we set* $\mathcal{B} := \emptyset$ *and* CI-simplicial($\mathcal{A}$) = TRUE. *Therefore,* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *is a complete intersection, moreover* $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ *is minimally generated by* $\{g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4, g_5\}$.

4 Ideal-theoretic complete intersection simplicial projective toric varieties and singularities.

In this section k denotes an algebraically closed field and we aim at giving a complete classification of all those simplicial projective toric varieties which are ideal-theoretic complete intersection and are either smooth or have exactly one singular point. This classification arises as a nontrivial consequence of Corollary 3.4.

The results to be proved in this section are the following two:

Theorem 4.1. *Let* k *be an algebraically closed field and* $X \subset \mathbb{P}_k^{n-1}$ *a smooth simplicial projective toric variety. Then,* X *is an ideal-theoretic complete intersection if and only if* X *is the plane monomial curve defined by*

$$x_1 = t_1^2,\ x_2 = t_2^2,\ x_3 = t_1t_2.$$

Theorem 4.2. *Let* k *be an algebraically closed field and* $X \subset \mathbb{P}_k^{n-1}$ *a simplicial projective toric variety with exactly one singular point. Then,* X *is an ideal-theoretic complete intersection if and only if*

- *either* X *is the monomial curve in* $\mathbb{P}_k^{n-1}$, $n \geq 3$, *of degree* $d \geq 3$ *defined by*

  $$x_1 = t_1^d,\ x_2 = t_2^d,\ x_3 = t_1^{d-1}t_2,\ x_4 = t_1^{d-d_4}t_2^{d_4} \ldots,\ x_n = t_1^{d-d_n}t_2^{d_n},$$

  where $1 < d_4 < \cdots < d_n < d$ *and* $d_4 \mid d_5 \mid \cdots \mid d_n \mid d$

- *or* X *is the surface in* $\mathbb{P}_k^3$ *of degree* 2 *defined by*

  $$x_1 = t_1^2,\ x_2 = t_2^2,\ x_3 = t_3^2,\ x_4 = t_1t_2.$$

To obtain these results, let us first study the affine pieces of a simplicial projective toric variety. Let X be a simplicial projective toric variety and take a set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}^m$, $\mathcal{A} =$

$\{de_1, \ldots, de_m, a_{m+1}, \ldots, a_n\}$ such that $X = V(I_{\mathcal{A}})$. Consider $\mathcal{U}_i := \mathbb{P}_k^{n-1} \setminus V(x_i)$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, then

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} (X \cap \mathcal{U}_i).$$

Indeed, if $p = (p_1 : \cdots : p_n) \in X$ and $p_1 = \cdots = p_m = 0$, then for all $j \in \{m+1, \ldots, n\}$, $x_j^d - \prod_{k=1}^m x_k^{a_{jk}} \in I_{\mathcal{A}}$, so $p_j = 0$ and this is not possible. Let us study the $X \cap \mathcal{U}_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Recall that $\mathcal{U}_i \simeq \mathbb{A}_k^{n-1}$ is given by

$$(b_1 : \ldots : b_n) \mapsto (b_1/b_i, \ldots,\, b_{i-1}/b_i,\, b_{i+1}/b_i, \ldots,\, b_n/b_i).$$

Combining this with $t^{a_j}/t_i^d = t^{a_j - de_i} = u^{a_j^{(i)}}$, where $a_j^{(i)} := (a_{j1}, \ldots, a_{ji-1}, 0, a_{ji+1}, \ldots, a_{jm}) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ and $u_j := t_j/t_i$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, m-n\} \setminus \{i\}$, we see that $X \cap \mathcal{U}_i$ is the image of the map $\mathbb{A}_k^{m-1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^{n-1}$ given by

$$u \mapsto (u_1^d, \ldots, u_{i-1}^d, u_{i+1}^d, \ldots, u_m^d, u^{a_{m+1}^{(i)}}, \ldots, u^{a_n^{(i)}}).$$

If we set $\mathcal{A}_i := \{de_1, \ldots, de_{i-1}, de_{i+1}, \ldots, de_m, a_{m+1}^{(i)}, \ldots, a_n^{(i)}\}$, then the affine piece $X \cap \mathcal{U}_i$ is the affine simplicial toric variety $Y_i := V(I_{\mathcal{A}_i})$.

Thus, a simplicial projective toric variety is covered by the affine pieces $Y_1, \ldots, Y_m$. Then, X is smooth if and only if so are the affine simplicial toric varieties $Y_1, \ldots, Y_m$. The following classical result characterizes when an affine toric variety is smooth.

Theorem 4.3. *[9, 14, 20] Let k be an algebraically closed field and let $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}^m$ be a set of nonzero vectors. Consider the affine toric variety $Y := V(I_{\mathcal{A}}) \subset \mathbb{A}_k^n$, the following are equivalent:*

- *Y is smooth.*
- *$0 \in \mathbb{A}_k^n$ is a non-singular point of Y.*
- *There exist $a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_r} \in \mathcal{A}$, where $r = \mathrm{rk}(\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{A})$ such that $a_k \in \sum_{j=1}^r \mathbb{N} a_{i_j}$ for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.*

Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 follow as a consequence of the following result.

Proposition 4.4. *Let k be an algebraically closed field and $X \subset \mathbb{P}_k^{n-1}$ $(n \geq 3)$ a simplicial projective toric variety whose singular points all belong to $V(x_i, x_j)$. Then, X is an ideal-theoretic complete intersection if and only if X is given parametrically by*

$$x_1 = t_1^2,\ \ldots,\ x_m = t_m^2,\ x_{m+1} = t_i t_j.$$

Proof. Assume that all singular points belong to $V(x_1, x_2)$. and consider the set of nonzero vectors $\mathcal{A} = \{de_1, \ldots, de_m, a_{m+1}, \ldots, a_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}^m$ such that $X = V(I_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $\gcd\{d, a_{ij} \mid m+1 \leq i \leq n,\ 1 \leq j \leq m\} = 1$, which we may assume. We denote

$$\lambda_{ij} := \min\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid (d-k)e_i + ke_j \in \mathcal{A}\} \text{ for all } i, j \in \{1, \ldots .m\},\ i \neq j.$$

Since X is covered by the affine pieces $Y_i = V(I_{\mathcal{A}_i})$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, where $\mathcal{A}_i \subset \mathbb{N}^m$, $\mathrm{rk}(\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{A}_i) = m-1$ and $\lambda_{ij}e_j \in \mathcal{A}_i$ for all $j \in \{1,\ldots,m\} \setminus \{i\}$; thus, by Theorem 4.3, we have that

$$Y_i \text{ is smooth} \Longleftrightarrow a_k^{(i)} \in \textstyle\sum_{j\in\{1,\ldots,m\}\setminus\{i\}} \mathbb{N}\,\lambda_{ij}e_j \text{ for every } k \in \{1,\ldots,n\};$$

or equivalently, if $\lambda_{ij} \mid d$ and $\lambda_{ij} \,|\, a_{kj}$ for all $k \in \{m+1,\ldots,n\}$ and $j \in \{1,\ldots,m\} \setminus \{i\}$.

Since the singular points of X belong to $V(x_1, x_2)$, the affine pieces Y_1, Y_2 are smooth. If we denote $\lambda := \lambda_{12}$, then $\lambda \mid d$ and $\lambda \mid d - \lambda_{21}$ because $\lambda_{21}e_1 + (d-\lambda_{21})e_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, thus we have that $\lambda \mid \lambda_{21}$, and by symmetry we get that $\lambda = \lambda_{21}$. Moreover, for all $j \geq 3$, $(d-\lambda_{1j})e_1 + \lambda_{1j}e_j \in \mathcal{A}$, this implies that $\lambda \mid \lambda_{1j}$ and it follows that $\lambda \mid \gcd\{d, a_{ij} \,|\, m+1 \leq i \leq n,\ 1 \leq j \leq m\} = 1$, so $\lambda = 1$ and $e_1 + (d-1)e_2$, $(d-1)e_1 + e_2 \in \mathcal{A}$.

Suppose that $d > 2$, and denote $a_{n-1} := e_1 + (d-1)e_2$, $a_n := (d-1)e_1 + e_2 \in \mathcal{A}$. From the equality $a_{n-1} + a_n = de_1 + de_2$ one can derive that $de_1, de_2, a_{n-1}, a_n \in \mathcal{A}_{red}$; thus by Corollary 3.4 we get that $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is not a complete intersection.

Assume now that $d = 2$, we have proved that $\{2e_1,\ldots,2e_m, e_1+e_2\} \subset \mathcal{A}$. If equality holds, then $B_{m+1} = 2$, $2a_{m+1} = 2e_1 + 2e_2$ and $\{2e_1,\ldots,2e_m\}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, so $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$ and $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection. On the contrary, suppose that there exists $e_i + e_j \in \mathcal{A}$ with $j \geq 3$, $i \neq j$

- if $i = 1$, then $\lambda_{2j} = 1$ and $e_2 + e_j \in \mathcal{A}$, so $(e_1+e_j)+(e_2+e_j)+(e_1+e_2) = 2e_1+2e_2+2e_j$
- if $i = 2$, then $\lambda_{1j} = 1$ and $e_1 + e_j \in \mathcal{A}$, so $(e_2+e_j)+(e_1+e_j)+(e_1+e_2) = 2e_1+2e_2+2e_j$
- if $i \geq 3$, $i \neq j$, then $\lambda_{1i} = \lambda_{2j} = 1$ and $e_1 + e_i, e_2 + e_j \in \mathcal{A}$, so $(e_1+e_i)+(e_i+e_j)+(e_j+e_2)+(e_1+e_2) = 2e_1+2e_2+2e_i+2e_j$.

Therefore, $B_i = 1$ and $B_i a_i \notin \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{N}a_j$ for $i \in \{m+1,\ldots,n\}$, which implies that $\mathcal{A}_{red} \neq \emptyset$. By Corollary 3.4, $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is not a complete intersection. □

With this result, the proof of Theorem 4.1 is straightforward

Proof. Let X be a smooth simplicial projective toric variety. If $m > 2$, then all singular points are contained in $V(x_1, x_2)$ and also in $V(x_1, x_3)$, thus by Proposition 4.4, X is not an ideal theoretic complete intersection. If $m = 2$, again by Proposition 4.4, one directly gets that $m = 2$ and X is given parametrically by $x_1 = t_1^2$, $x_2 = t_2^2$, $x_3 = t_1t_2$. □

Now, we proceed with the proof of Theorem 4.2.

Proof. First note that there exists an only $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$ such that Y_i is not smooth, otherwise by Theorem 4.3, there is more than one singular point. So we assume that $Y_1,\ldots,Y_{m-1}$ are smooth. If $m \geq 3$, by Proposition 4.4, one directly gets $m = 3$ and X is given parametrically by $x_1 = t_1^2$, $x_2 = t_2^2$, $x_3 = t_3^2$, $x_4 = t_1t_2$.

It remains to consider the case of projective monomial curves, i.e., when $m = 2$, with exactly one singular point. In this case, we may assume that $X = V(I_{\mathcal{A}})$, where

$$\mathcal{A} = \{de_1,\, de_2,\, (d-d_3)e_1 + d_3e_2, \ldots,\, (d-d_n)e_1 + d_ne_2\}$$

with $d_3 < \cdots < d_n < d$ and $\gcd\{d, d_3, \ldots, d_n\} = 1$. Moreover Y_1 is smooth, which implies that $\lambda_{12} = \min\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, (d-k)e_1 + ke_2 \in \mathcal{A}\} = d_3$ divides every element in $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{d, d_3, \ldots, d_n\}$, and thus $d_3 = 1$. Conversely if $d_3 = 1$, then Y_1 is smooth.

Now we will prove by induction on $n \geq 3$ that $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection, where

$$\mathcal{A} = \{de_1,\, de_2,\, (d-1)e_1 + e_2, (d-d_4)e_1 + d_4e_2, \ldots,\, (d-d_n)e_1 + d_ne_2\},$$

if and only if $d_4 \mid \cdots \mid d_n \mid d$.

For $n = 3$, we have that $\mathcal{A} = \{de_1, de_2, (d-1)e_1 + e_2\}$ and one has $B_3 = d$ and $B_3a_3 = (d-1)de_1 + de_2$. Moreover, de_1, de_2 are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, so $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$ and by Corollary 3.4, $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection. If $n \geq 4$, we observe that $a_i = d_ia_3 + (1-d_i)de_1$ for all $i \in \{4, \ldots, n\}$, so $B_i = 1$. Moreover, it is easy to check that $ba_3 \in \sum_{\substack{i\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\\ i\neq 3}} \mathbb{Z}a_i$ with $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $b \in \mathbb{Z}\{d_4, \ldots, d_n\}$; thus $B_3 = \gcd\{d_4, \ldots, d_n, d\}$. Moreover,

$$B_3a_3 \in \textstyle\sum_{j\in\{1,\ldots,m\}\setminus\{3\}} \mathbb{N}a_j \Longleftrightarrow d_4 = \gcd\{d_4, \ldots, d_n, d\};$$

and in this case, $B_3a_3 = a_4 + (d_4 - 1)a_1$. Thus, $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection if and only if $d_4 = \gcd\{d_4, \ldots, d_n, d\}$ and $I_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\{a_3\}}$ is a complete intersection. Now we set $d' := d/d_4 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $d_i' := d_i/d_4 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ for all $i \in \{4, \ldots, n\}$ and $\mathcal{A}' := \{d'e_1, d'e_2, (d'-1)e_1 + e_2, (d'-d_5')e_1 + d_5'e_2, \ldots,\, (d'-d_n')e_1 + d_n'e_2\}$. It is straightforward to check that $I_{\mathcal{A}\setminus\{a_3\}} = I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ and by induction hypothesis we have that $I_{\mathcal{A}'}$ is a complete intersection if and only if $d_5' \mid \cdots \mid d_n' \mid d$, which implies that $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection if and only if $d_4 \mid d_5 \mid \cdots \mid d_n \mid d$. $\square$

Furthermore, following Remark 2.8, we get the defining equations of the ideal-theoretic complete intersection simplicial projective toric varieties that are smooth or have one singular point.

Corollary 4.5. *Let k be an algebraically closed field and $X \subset \mathbb{P}_k^{n-1}$ a smooth simplicial projective toric variety. Then, X is an ideal-theoretic complete intersection if and only if X is the curve in $\mathbb{P}_k^3$ with equation $x_3^2 - x_1x_2 = 0$.*

Corollary 4.6. *Let k be an algebraically closed field and $X \subset \mathbb{P}_k^{n-1}$ a simplicial projective toric variety with exactly one singular point. Then, X is an ideal-theoretic complete intersection if and only if*

- *either X is the monomial curve in $\mathbb{P}_k^{n-1}$, $n \geq 3$ with defining equations*

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} x_3^{b_3} - x_1^{b_3-1}x_4 & = & 0 \\ x_4^{b_4} - x_1^{b_4-1}x_5 & = & 0 \\ \vdots & & \\ x_{n-1}^{b_{n-1}} - x_1^{b_{n-1}-1}x_n & = & 0 \\ x_n^{b_n} - x_1^{b_n-1}x_2 & = & 0 \end{array}\right.$$

where either $n \geq 4$ and $b_3, \ldots, b_n \geq 2$ or $n = 3$ and $b_3 \geq 3$,

- *or X is the surface in $\mathbb{P}_k^3$ of degree 2 with equation $x_4^2 - x_1x_2 = 0$.*

5 Computational aspects

In this section we will explain how we have implemented the algorithms obtained in Section 4 for checking whether a simplicial projective or a simplicial toric ideal is a complete intersection. We have implemented these algorithms in C++ and in SINGULAR. The implementation in SINGULAR gave rise to the distributed library `cisimplicial.lib`, which is included in the software since version 3-1-4.

Given $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ a simplicial projective toric ideal, according to Corollary 3.4, to check whether $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection one can verify if $\mathcal{A}_{red} = \emptyset$. For this purpose one has to design procedures to solve the following problems

- to check whether an element $b \in \mathbb{N}^m$ belongs to a subsemigroup of $\mathbb{N}^m$
- to compute $B_i := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid b\, a_i \in \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{Z}\, a_j\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

For solving the first problem we have implemented a full enumeration procedure. An algorithm based on a Graph Theory approach can be found in [8], for yet another methods we refer the reader to [23] and the references there.

Example 5.1. *In* `cisimplicial.lib` *we have implemented the function* **belongSemigroup**, *which performs an enumeration to check whether an element* $b \in \mathbb{N}^m$ *belongs to a subsemigroup of* $\mathbb{N}^m$. *This function receives as input an* $m \times n$ *integral matrix* A *and a vector* $b \in \mathbb{N}^m$ *and checks whether the system of equations* $A\,x = b$ *has a solution* $x \in \mathbb{N}^n$, *it returns a solution whenever such it exists or* 0 *if it does not exist. The following example shows how to use* `cisimplicial.lib` *to check that* $b := (22, 12, 10)$ *belongs to the semigroup spanned by* $\mathcal{A}$, *meanwhile* $c := (12, 4, 1)$ *does not, where* $\mathcal{A} = \{(10, 2, 5),\ (3, 1, 0),\ (2, 1, 1),\ (1, 3, 2)\}$.

```
> intmat A[3][4] = 10, 3, 2, 1,
                    2, 1, 1, 3,
                    5, 0, 1, 2;
> intvec b = 23,12,10;
> intvec c = 12,4,1;
> belongSemigroup(b,A);
 1,3,1,2       // A * (1 3 1 2)^t = b
> belongSemigroup(c,A);
 0             // A * x^t = c has no solution x ∈ ℕ^n
```

To solve the second problem we use the following result:

Lemma 5.2. *Let* $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ *be a set of vectors in* $\mathbb{N}^m$ *and suppose that* $a_i \in \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{Q}\, a_j$ *for some* $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-m\}$. *Then*

$$B_i = \frac{\mathrm{Card}(T(\mathbb{Z}^m / \sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{Z}a_j))}{\mathrm{Card}(T(\mathbb{Z}^m / \sum_{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}} \mathbb{Z}a_j))},$$

where $T(-)$ *denotes de torsion subgroup of an abelian group.*

Proof. Let A be the integral matrix whose i-th column is a_i for all $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$ and let A_j be the matrix obtained by deleting the j-th column of A for each $j \in \{1,\dots,n\}$. By definition B_i is the minimum $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that the system $A_i\, x = ka_i$ has an integral solution $x \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$. Moreover, by [17, p. 51], the system $A_i x = ka_i$ has an integral solution $x \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$ if and only if $\Delta_r(A_i) = \Delta_r([A_i\ ka_i])$, where $r = \mathrm{rk}(A_i) = \mathrm{rk}(A)$. Moreover, $\Delta_r([A_i\ ka_i]) = \gcd\{\Delta_r(A_i), k\Delta_r(A)\}$; and $\Delta_r(A)$ divides $\Delta_r(A_i)$, thus

$$B_i = \frac{\Delta_r(A_i)}{\Delta_r(A)}.$$

Finally, it is well known that $\Delta_r(A) = \mathrm{Card}(T(\mathbb{Z}^m/\sum_{j\in\{1,\dots,n\}} \mathbb{Z}a_j))$ and $\Delta_r(A_i) = \mathrm{Card}(T(\mathbb{Z}^m/\sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\dots,n\}\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{Z}a_j))$, see e.g. [28, Lemma 1.3.17]. $\square$

This result reduces the problem of computing B_i to that of computing the order of the torsion subgroup of two finitely generated abelian groups, which we compute in polynomial time by means of the Hermite Normal Form of a matrix, see [7, Theorem 2.4.3 and Algorithm 2.4.5].

Example 5.3. *In* `cisimplicial.lib` *we compute B_i by means of the function* **cardGroup**. *This function computes the order of a finite abelian group, it receives as input an $m \times n$ integral matrix C and returns the order of the group $\mathbb{Z}^n/G$, or -1 if it is infinite, where G denotes the group spanned by the columns of C. The following example shows how to compute with* `cisimplicial.lib` *the order of $\mathbb{Z}^3/G$, where G is the group spanned by* $\{(24,0,0), (0,24,0), (0,0,24), (8,10,5), (3,6,9)\}$.

```
> intmat C[3][5] = 24,  0,  0,  8,  3,
                    0, 24,  0, 10,  6,
                    0,  0, 24,  5,  9;
> cardGroup(C);
 72             // The order of the group Z^3/G is 72
```

To implement the Algorithm CI-simplicial, besides the problems of computing B_i and checking whether a vector belongs to a subsemigroup of $\mathbb{N}^m$, a key point is the computation of m_i for every a_i such that $a_i \in \mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\})$. If one wants to compute explicitly these values one could generalize the method introduced in [2, Section 4.1.2] based on a Graph Theory representation of the problem. However, we have perfomed an implementation in which we do not aim at finding the optimum value m_i but only at checking whether there exist a_i, a_j such that $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$. For this purpose we define for every $a_i \in \mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{A}\setminus\{a_i\})$ the set $\mathcal{L}_i := \{a_j \in \mathcal{A} \,|\, \exists\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\lambda a_i = a_j\}$, we take $k(i) \in \{1,\dots,m\}$ such that $a_{i\,k(i)} \neq 0$ and set

$$\overline{m}_i := \min\{b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \,|\, b\, a_{i\,k(i)} \in \textstyle\sum_{\substack{a_j\in\mathcal{L}_i\\ j\neq i}} \mathbb{N}\, a_{j\,k(i)}\}.$$

Note that $\overline{m}_i$ can be computed following the method proposed in [2, Section 4.1.2]. Moreover, the following properties hold:

- $\overline{m}_i \geq m_i$ because $\overline{m}_i a_i \in \sum_{\substack{a_j \in \mathcal{L}_i \\ j \neq i}} \mathbb{N} a_j$
- if $m_i a_i = m_j a_j$, then $a_j \in \mathcal{L}_i$ and $m_i = \overline{m}_i$.
- $m_i = \overline{m}_i$ if and only if the only solution $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ to the system of equations $x_1 a_1 + \cdots + x_n a_n = (\overline{m}_i - 1) a_i$ is the trivial one, i.e., $x_i = \overline{m}_i - 1$ and $x_j = 0$ for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{i\}$. In particular, if $\overline{m}_i = 1$, then $m_i = 1$.

Thus, one can avoid the exact computation of m_i by computing $\overline{m}_i$ and by checking whether a system of diophantine equations has more than one nonnegative integral solution. Moreover, this problem is equivalent to check whether the system of equations

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} x_1 a_1 + \cdots + x_n a_n = (\overline{m}_i - 1) a_i \\ x_i + x_{n+1} = \overline{m}_i - 2 \end{array}\right\}$$

has a solution $(x_1, \ldots, x_n, x_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1}$, which we solve by enumeration.

We have produced an implementation of Algorithm CI-simplicial following the techniques we have already described. Computational experiments show that our implementation of CI-simplicial is able to solve large size instances. For example, we have produced examples of simplicial toric ideals $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ with $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{27}\} \subset \mathbb{N}^8$ and $0 \leq a_{ij} \leq 4000$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 27$, $1 \leq j \leq 8$ and we have determined in less than a second on a personal computer with Intel Pentium IV 3Ghz whether $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection.

Example 5.4. *The main function in* `cisimplicial.lib` *is called* **isCI**. *It receives an $m \times n$ integral matrix A whose columns correspond to vectors in $\mathcal{A} = \{d_1 e_1, \ldots, d_m e_m, a_{m+1}, \ldots, a_n\}$ and returns* 0 *if the simplicial toric ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is not a complete intersection or* 1 *otherwise. Whenever $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection, it also returns a minimal set of binomials generating the ideal. The following example shows how to use* `cisimplicial.lib` *to check that $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is not a complete intersection and $I_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a complete intersection, where:*

- $\mathcal{A} := \{(12,0,0),\ (0,10,0),\ (0,0,8),\ (1,3,3),\ (2,2,3)\}$, *and*
- $\mathcal{B} := \{(52,0,0),\ (0,52,0),\ (0,0,52),\ (20,30,100),\ (28,42,140),\ (30,45,150),\ (42,63,210),\ (32,32,48),\ (36,36,54),\ (40,40,6012)\}$.

```
> intmat A[3][5] = 12,  0,  0,  1,  2,
                    0, 10,  0,  3,  2,
                    0,  0,  8,  3,  3;
> isCI(A);
 0                // It is not a complete intersection
> intmat B[3][10] =
 52,   0,   0,  20,  28,  30,  42,  32,  36,  40,
  0,  52,   0,  30,  42,  45,  63,  32,  36,  40,
  0,   0,  52, 100, 140, 150, 210,  48,  54, 6012;
> isCI(B);
```

```
1                // It is a complete intersection
// Generators of the toric ideal
toric[1]=x(4)^3-x(6)^2
toric[2]=x(5)^3-x(7)^2
toric[3]=x(4)^2*x(6)-x(5)*x(7)
toric[4]=x(8)^5-x(10)^4
toric[5]=-x(9)^2+x(8)*x(10)
toric[6]=-x(1)^2*x(2)^3*x(3)^10+x(4)*x(7)^2
toric[7]=-x(1)^2*x(2)^2*x(3)^3+x(8)^2*x(10)
```

References

[1] A. Alcántar and R. H. Villarreal, Critical binomials of monomial curves, Comm. Algebra **22** (1994), 3037–3052.

[2] I. Bermejo, I. García-Marco and J. J. Salazar-González, An algorithm for checking whether the toric ideal of an affine monomial curve is a complete intersection, J. Symbolic Computation **42** (2007) 971–991.

[3] I. Bermejo, I. García-Marco and J. J. Salazar-González, `cimonom.lib`. A SINGULAR 3-0-3 library for determining whether the toric ideal of an affine monomial curve is a complete intersection (2007).

[4] I. Bermejo and I. García-Marco, `cisimplicial.lib`. A distributed SINGULAR 3-1-4 library for determining whether a simplicial toric ideal is a complete intersection (2012).

[5] I. Bermejo, Ph. Gimenez, E. Reyes and R. H. Villarreal, Complete intersections in affine monomial curves, Bol. Soc. Mat. Mexicana 3a. Serie **11 (2)** (2005) 191–204.

[6] J. Bertin and P. Carbonne, Sur la structure des semi-groupes d'entiers et application aux branches. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A **280** (1975), no. 25, 1745–1748.

[7] H. Cohen, *A course in computational algebraic number theory.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 138. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.

[8] E. Contejean and H. Devie, An efficient incremental algorithm for solving systems of linear equations, Information and computation **113** (1994), 143–172.

[9] D. A. Cox, J. Little and H. K. Schenck, *Toric varieties*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 124. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011.

[10] W. Decker, G.-M. Greuel, G. Pfister and H. Schoenemann, SINGULAR 3-1-4, a Computer Algebra System for Polynomial Computations, Center for Computer Algebra, University of Kaiserslautern. Available at `http://www.singular.uni-kl.de` (2012).

[11] S. Eliahou, *Courbes monomiales et algèbre de Rees symbolique*, PhD Thesis, Université de Genève, 1983.

[12] S. Eliahou and R. H. Villarreal, On systems of binomials in the ideal of a toric variety, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130** (2002), 345–351.

[13] K. Fischer and J. Shapiro, Mixed matrices and binomial ideals, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **113** (1996), 39–54.

[14] W. Fulton, *Introduction to toric varieties*, Annals of Math. Studies 131, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.

[15] P. A. García-Sánchez and J. C. Rosales, On complete intersection affine semigroups, Communications in Algebra **23(14)** (1995), 5395–5412.

[16] P. A. García-Sánchez and J. C. Rosales, On free affine semigroups. Semigroup Forum **58** (1999), no. 3, 367–385

[17] J. Heger, Denkschriften, Kais. Akad. Wissensch. Mathem. Naturw. Klasse **14** (1858) , II.

[18] S. Hosten and J. Shapiro, Primary Decomposition of Lattice Basis Ideals, J. Symb. Comput. 29 (2000), no. 4-5, 625–639.

[19] A. Katsabekis and A. Thoma, Toric sets and orbits on toric varieties, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **181** (2003) 75–83.

[20] G. Kempf, F. F. Knudsen, D. Mumford and B. Saint-Donat, *Toroidal embeddings I*, Lecture Notes in Math. **339**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg/New York, 1973.

[21] M. Morales, Noetherian Symbolic Blow-ups, J. Algebra **140** (1991), 12–25.

[22] M. Morales and A. Thoma, Complete intersection lattice ideals, Journal of Algebra **284** (2005), 755–770.

[23] P. Pisón and A. Vignerón-Tenorio, $\mathbb{N}$-solutions to linear systems over $\mathbb{Z}$, Linear Algebra and its Applications, **384** (2004), no. 1, 135–154

[24] M. Şahin, Extensions of toric varieties, Electron. J. Comb. **18** (2011) no. 1, Research Papers P93.

[25] B. Sturmfels, *Gröbner Bases and Convex Polytopes*, University Lecture Series **8**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.

[26] A. Thoma, Affine semigroup rings and monomial varieties, Communications in Algebra **24(7)** (1996), 2463–2471.

[27] R. H. Villarreal, *Monomial Algebras*, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics **238**, Marcel Dekker, New York, 2001.

[28] R. H. Villarreal, *Combinatorial Optimization Methods in Commutative Algebra*, in progress.

[29] K. Watanabe, Some examples of one dimensional Gorenstein domains, Nagoya Math. J. **49** (1973) 101–109.

Isabel Bermejo, Ignacio García-Marco
Departamento de Matemática Fundamental. Facultad de Matemáticas.
Universidad de La Laguna. 38200 La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain
`ibermejo@ull.es, iggarcia@ull.es`